

tion, that the anti-slavery enterprise is of a political character, as false and pernicious: 2. that the

not party men; but political actors; 3. that it excludes a broad distinction between political and religious actors; 4. that it implies, that, 'in the judgment of the American Anti-Slavery Society' there is no distinction between politics and religion; any more than between light and darkness!

Without stopping to examine the truthfulness of the grave charge, I venture to make the inquiry, whether it is the appropriate business of Mr. Birney, who is the Secretary of the Parent Society, and in its name organ, to determine for abolitionists, who in the

may or may not use the lurch or the coward in the management of their children? If so, I do not see how he may not as properly sit in judgment upon our poetic habits and our theological speculations—and thus act as a Board of Inspection appointed to scrutinize the qualifications of persons proposing themselves for membership, touching all questions relating to the physical, or divinity, as well as to the abolition of slavery.

I have thus attempted—with what success the reader of the Emancipator must judge—to reply to the political arguments of Mr. Birney, and to show precisely the attitude in which those stand, who are for taking political action at the polls the next of November, in the anti-slavery organization. To the assertion of Mr. B., that 'the no-government theory is but a new growth of one of the *fauxes* which sprang up in the early period of the Reformation'—

most horrible excesses," I shall now merely repeat the naked denial of its truth. The *non probatur* rests upon the accuser, not upon the accused. It is like him to acknowledge that he has done gross injustice to those, whose moral déposition he cannot impugn, and who (as he confesses) wholly deny and repudiate what he supposes to be the legitimate consequences of their scheme. The principles of non-resistance

Non-Resistants are as opposite to those whose armies
characterised the Anabaptists in Germany, as is busi-
ness to sin, light to darkness, and mercy to cruelty.
Thus saith the Lord—Cursed are all they who trust in
man, or who make flesh their arm. 'Blessed are the
peace-makers; for they shall be called the children
of God.' Yours fraternally,
WM. LLOYD GARRISON.

Boston, May 31, 1839.

The Editor of the Emancipator introduced a
 Reply to Mr. Birney with the following remarks
 which evince a disturbed state of mind. I append
 a few brief notes.

MR. GARRISON'S REPLY.

Owing to the length of the subjoined document, viz
 Mr. Garrison's particular request that it should be

this week, the remarks which we had intended to print on Mr. Adams' second letter to the printers, are necessarily postponed. With regard to the defense itself, we have but a word to say. The violent denunciations of such men as Birney and Stanton, and other devoted and consistent abolitionists, will doubtless find their own level.(1) It is well known that the editor differs from Mr. B. as to the particular point which he aimed to establish—viz. that the adherents of the 'No

Human-Government' theory are not constitutionally entitled to membership in the Anti-Slavery Society. At the same time, it is plain that they act very vigorously as members, when they thus set themselves to disparage and destroy one of the main reasons of the society for the accomplishment of its object.² Mr. Garrison treats what Mr. Birney had said about the 'No-Human-Government' theory, as if he had said the same things against 'the pacific precepts of the Gospel, which is essentially a different matter.' (2)

per, which the church assumes, that 'Non-Resistance' is the same with the Human-Government; and that refraining from going to the polls on account of religious scruples, by Covenanters and Friends) is the same thing that rejection and attempted overthrow of all human government whatever; (1) and that petitioning Congress to 'cease upholding slavery' in the District, is the same as endeavoring, in a constitutional way, to induce Congress to *put an end to the domestic*

trade, and to abolish slavery,' (5) and that this is a matter which the constitution binds the society to do in every matter. Mr. Garrison objects to the citation of his own example in an argument on the interpretation of the constitution, and yet he makes great use of the example of May, Winslow, and others (6). He thinks that his paper is 'the official journal of any sane body of men,' while it is at this very time published under the charge of a committee, who put it forth

pressly as the GRAND ORGAN (1) of THE NEW YORK TRIBUNE, Mr. Garrison does not deny that he has identified the leader with the 'No-Human-Government' theory, and hence has done what was in his power to identify (not the Anti-Slavery Society, but that which is called the Society.) the 'Anti-Slavery movement' with schemes of that party (9). There are several other inconsistencies which we will not now stop to notice. We deny entirely the correctness of his reasoning, and prove that the Anti-Slavery Society is not the

Resistance principles by the third article of its constitution (10) 'The self-complacent insinuation, that there is a deep plot "to cast off" Mr. G. in order to place him in the aristocracy,' shows a distempered imagination (11). But we will not extend our remarks. Let the deluded stand for what it is worth, and let us all stand as do abolitionists, by the gospel rule of 'what we do advance the cause: (12) 'BY THEIR FRUITS ye shall know them.'

(1) 'Violent denunciations?' The unbraced reader will not be able to find any in the Reply. Neither Mr. Birney nor Mr. Stanton is above or beyond racism; though there are some in the anti-slavery ranks who seem to think far otherwise. I have simply denied the soundness of the doctrines and the truthfulness of the allegations contained in Mr. Brewster's report.

(2) 'As members' of the Anti-Slavery Society, non-resistants are doing much to quicken and regenerate political action for the overthrow of slavery—as I have shown in my Reply. The insinuation of bro. Leavitt

it, therefore, is not warranted by the facts in the case. He begs the very question in dispute, even after stating that he does not agree with Mr. Birney's construction of the Constitution—namely, that non-residents cannot be sound members of the Society! Any politician has a perfect right, as a man and a citizen, either to 'disparage' or praise political action or the people, and to do so without fear or reproach.

(3) I ask that the difference may be shown by something more convincing than mere assertion. Should bro. Leavitt retort, that it is for me to prove the agreement between the non-resistance theory and 'the pacific precepts of the gospel,' I answer, that I

(4) This is making a false issue. My argument in the Reply, (as the reader will see.) is not that Corentins &c. perfectly agree with Non-Resistants in this point, but that they cannot con-

(5) If Congress were to 'cease upholding slavery' in the District, the system would be abolished, to all intents and purposes. I think that is the only way to get to those who support their part of their reported to be Mr. Russell's matter which nothing should be doing, or the to commit.

(6) In attempting to convict me of inconsistency, Mr. Leavitt makes a palpable blunder. Will the reader turn to that part of my Reply, here referred to by him? The ground I assume is, that the Anti-Slavery Society is not and never has been responsible for any of my religious or political sentiments, promulgated by me. I suppose, that it concerns

ough the medium of the Liberator, I have
to man to know how many or how few times I may
have voted since the organization of the Parent Society
; that what I may have said or done, and what the
constitution enjoins, are wholly distinct questions. The
Editor of the Emancipator coincides with this state-
ment, in dissenting from the opinions entertained by
Mr. Birney. Now, in order to show that the use of

elective franchise was not even dreamed of. I was authorized to sign the Declaration of Sentiments on behalf of the Anti-Slavery Society, I have signed the fact that at least two of the signers of that Declaration, Samuel J. May and Isaac Winslow, held that time, and do still cherish, conscientious senti-



From the N. Y. Morning Herald of June 14

[illegible]